


[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

2012 System Performance Measures Report



The purpose of this report is to provide data on the condition and performance of Michigan's publicly-owned* transportation system. This report represents the first phase of a multi-phased effort within MDOT and includes data that is readily available at this time.

Full Screen

[On/Off](#)

[Send Feedback](#)

**All performance measures in this report refer to assets owned, maintained, or financed (in whole or in part) by the Michigan Department of Transportation.*

Overview »

► [Background](#)

[About the Site/Report](#)

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

Purpose of the Report

Report Subject Matter

Importance & Development

Report Updates

What are the intended purposes of the report?

The purpose of this report is to provide data on the condition and performance of Michigan's publicly-owned transportation system. This report represents the first phase of a multi-phased effort within MDOT and includes data that is readily available at this time.*

Performance measurement uses statistical evidence to determine progress toward specific defined organizational objectives. It provides MDOT customers and stakeholders with simple answers to questions such as "What is the condition of Michigan's highways?" or "What is the status of Michigan's local transit services?" based on factual measurements and informed professional observations. The more detailed report levels also provide MDOT staff with a framework to consistently drive improvements in processes, performance, and outcomes. Although the report is not designed to be a self-contained process improvement solution, it can be a valuable tool for increasing understanding through analysis. Staff at all levels will benefit from broader diagnostic input. They can use their professional judgment and experience to effectively apply strategic remedies based on accurate data from these performance measures.

This reporting initiative intends to provide information about the transportation system in a simple and convenient format that can be easily accessed by anyone who finds it useful. Several levels or tiers of reporting allow different audiences (both inside and outside MDOT) to view the information to whatever degree might be appropriate for their needs and understanding. A top-level overview offers a quick system snapshot. In addition, anyone with sufficient interest can "drill down" to expanding levels of detail.

In developing the initial MDOT Strategic Plan, the Strategic Planning Team made the following observation: "Measuring progress is a fundamental aspect of continuous improvement; however, measures must be strategically selected or they will become cumbersome, time-consuming and ineffective. MDOT should identify those aspects of transportation service that are most important to its customers and develop a limited set of measures focused on progress in those areas. This will focus MDOT actions on those aspects of operations with the potential for the greatest positive impact on customer satisfaction."

**All performance measures in this report refer to assets owned, maintained, or financed (in whole or in part) by the Michigan Department of Transportation.*

Overview »

 [Background](#)

[About the Site/Report](#)

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

Purpose of the Report

Report Subject Matter

Importance & Development

Report Updates

What are performance measures?

Performance measures are clear and concise statements that identify specific criteria, or benchmarks, for MDOT and others to use in judging the condition and performance of the transportation system.

What is included in the report?

Measures chosen for this report are only a representative sample of the countless measurements and data that could potentially be tracked by MDOT in the course of overseeing the building, maintenance, and operation of the state's transportation system. Those included in this initial report were chosen both for their relative importance and because reliable data was readily available to support them. The selection of measures presented may change as the report is refined and as experience dictates.

This performance measure report includes definitions of standards along with status information that can be used to:

- Objectively assess progress toward achieving intended outcomes.
- Make results visible both inside and outside MDOT.

For road and bridge related measures, this report focuses on those roads and bridges for which MDOT is directly responsible. Local and county roads are not included, except in the crash-related measures. For the other modes, such as transit and airports, only those portions of the system for which MDOT has consistent and reliable data are included.

Data included in this report comes from various sources with diverse measurement and reporting schedules, as noted throughout. All figures show the most recently available data from each source.

All reported data is owned and managed by MDOT unless otherwise indicated.

IMPORTANT!

Some content is denoted: "USE RESTRICTED: 23 USC 409 and/or 402(k)(1)"
Click the link to view [RESTRICTED USE NOTICE](#) details.

Full Screen

On/Off **Send Feedback**

Overview »

► [Background](#)

[About the Site/Report](#)

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

Purpose of the Report

Report Subject Matter

Importance & Development

Report Updates

Why are performance measures important?

In general, performance measures are important because:

- They provide MDOT staff with a continuing source of accessible information to guide decisions.
- Accurate reporting is fundamental to meaningful dialog with customers and stakeholders.
- Transparency and accountability are important to MDOT.

The performance measures included in this report are tied to the four goal areas of the [State Long-Range Transportation Plan](#). The four goal areas are: Stewardship, Safety and Security, System Improvement, and Efficient and Effective Operation. While the individual measures reported may change over time, this close connection ensures that the focus and importance of the reporting remains constant.

Reported measures include those that directly touch the public in matters ranging from highway safety, congestion, and ride quality, to transportation system access and multi-modal availability, to name just a few. Providing the best possible service to customers and stakeholders lies at the core of MDOT's mission:

"Providing the highest quality integrated transportation services for economic benefit and improved quality of life."

How was the report developed?

In an effort to provide a starting point, this report is being developed in phases. This is an evolutionary process.

Within MDOT, staff teams were assigned to each of four major goal areas of the State Long-Range Transportation Plan and an MDOT Performance Measurement Core Team was established to coordinate the effort. These teams selected a representative sample of key system outputs to measure, each in support of their assigned goal area. Although the report development process has been entirely internal to MDOT, the performance measurement teams at all levels did consider the work of other state and federal groups while determining recommended performance measures. Teams have focused on using existing data to the greatest extent possible, both to avoid the need to dedicate additional resources for data collection and to more quickly and effectively integrate performance measurement into everyday operations. The selection of measures presented in the report will very likely change over the coming year or two as MDOT gains experience in this area and receives public and stakeholder feedback.

We welcome your comments and questions. Use the feedback button on each page to send us an e-mail.

Overview »

[Background](#)

[About the Site/Report](#)

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

Purpose of the Report

Report Subject Matter

Importance & Development

Report Updates

When and how often will the report be updated?

This report will be updated twice in 2011. The first update will be in February/March 2011 and the second will be in August/September 2011. The title bar of each page of the report shows the date of the last report update. Look for the phrase: *Last Updated 03/26/2010*

Some measures will be updated in February/March and others will be updated in August/September.

For additional assistance, the first page of each measure shows when that particular measure is updated. Look for boxes like these:

Data is collected within MDOT:	September
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March

Data is collected within MDOT:	Available throughout the year
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

If the data is collected more frequently than once a year, more current data may be available by contacting MDOT using the "Send Feedback" button.

Overview »

[Background](#)

[About the Site/Report](#)

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

Structure of the Report

How to Navigate This Report

Restricted Use Notice

Site/Report Structure

This three-level report is comprised of:

1. Condition Trends, including information from each of the four main goal areas from the [State Long-Range Transportation Plan](#):

- Stewardship
- Safety & Security
- System Improvement
- Efficient & Effective Operations

Summary indices in the "Condition Trends" level encapsulate the status and historical trends of all measures, and provide a glimpse of report content. However, there is substantial additional content in the second level. Readers are encouraged to go beyond this top level. This level is expected to be the most succinct "thumbnail" segment of the report. All four main reporting areas share the single page of the Condition Trends level.

2. Within the second level are each of the measurement standards currently being reported for each goal. This is a more complete story compiled from underlying data. This level is expected to be the most complete yet understandable report section for practical use by the average reader. Each segment indicates the measure, definition, standard, and status of the component under examination.

Every measure begins with an AIM (Action Intent of Measure). This statement indicates the intended result toward which the measure is directed. Many of these AIMs are drawn directly from the State Long-Range Transportation Plan. Others are logical outgrowths supporting the more general goals of the plan. The AIM both helps readers understand why a specific measure is being tracked and serves as one way to check the report's scope.

3. A foundational third level of "raw" data detail and trend graphs. This is the underlying information upon which both of the higher levels of the report are based. Also included at this level are broad indications of general trends and informed predictions of future status, when available.

Overview »

[Background](#)

► [About the Site/Report](#)

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

Structure of the Report

How to Navigate This Report

Restricted Use Notice

Site/Report Navigation

In general, you can use the menu bars and sub-topics on the left side of the screen. Clicking one of the main menu bars opens the slider to reveal main topics and sub-topics. Or you can click [Measures by Goal Area](#) and choose a specific measure from the grouped listing on the right. Measures listed in the Condition Trends are also linked to their respective second-level content pages.

- Clicking the topic or sub-topic link displays the corresponding information in the main screen.
- An indicator arrow and violet menu title let you know “where you are” in the report. ► [You Are Here](#)
- Click the "Back" link near the top of the menu to return to the previous screen.
- The topics covered in this report often have more than one component. Please note the presence of multiple tabs at the tops of many of the pages.
- The links for accessing the "third-level" supporting details, if any, are always found at the bottom of the "second-level" page.
- Words or abbreviations that are blue and underlined are clickable links. These take you to additional information such as definitions, lists, maps, or outside resources that support or clarify items in the report. Links leading to locations outside the report mention “http” or “online” in the tool-tip text that appears when you hold your mouse over the link. Naturally, an active connection to the Internet will be required for accessing these destinations.
- When you view the report locally (from a copy saved on your own computer), clicking anywhere on the screen that is not a link or button will take you to the next page. If you wanted to see the entire report, you could start at the beginning and just keep clicking the screen until you got to the end.
- **SAVING AND PRINTING:** If you would like to save a copy of the report to your own computer or print a hard copy, follow these steps:
 1. Click the “Full Screen On/Off” button in the lower left corner to get out of the full screen mode.
 2. Use the “Print” or “Save” buttons on the Adobe toolbar that becomes visible just above the report.

Full Screen

On/Off **Send Feedback**

Overview »

[Background](#)

► [About the Site/Report](#)

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

Structure of the Report

How to Navigate This Report

Restricted Use Notice

RESTRICTED USE NOTICE 23 USC 409 AND 402(k)(1)

This report provides information of which disclosure is restricted by federal law. It is the intent of these federal laws that this information not be disclosed, discovered or admitted into evidence for use in lawsuits for damages at locations addressed by this information. Federal law provides:

23 USC 409:

Reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, or planning the safety enhancement of potential accident sites, hazardous roadway conditions, or railway-highway crossings . . . or for the purpose of developing any highway safety construction improvement project which may be implemented utilizing Federal-aid highway funds shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed. . . .

23 USC 402(k)(1):

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a report, list, schedule, or survey is prepared by or for a State of political subdivision thereof under this subsection ["a comprehensive computerized safety record-keeping system designed to correlate data regarding traffic accidents, drivers, motor vehicles, and roadways"]. Such report, list, schedule, or survey shall not be admitted as evidence or used in any suit or action for damages arising out of any matter mentioned in such report, list, schedule, or survey.

Information covered by these sections includes information compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating or planning safety enhancement projects and construction projects and information contained in computerized safety record keeping systems which correlate traffic crash data with highway features.

By providing information covered by 23 USC 409 and 402(k)(1), MDOT does not waive any objection it may have based on these sections. For your convenience the information covered by these sections is labeled "**USE RESTRICTED: 23 USC 409 and/or 402(k)(1)**"

[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

► [All Condition Trends](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

Condition Trends for All Measures as of February 2012 *(All measures are links.)*

Measure <i>(Click on a measure to get more information.)</i>	Status	Change from Last Report	Change over Last 5 Years
Freeway Bridge Condition	Green	↑	↑
Non-freeway Trunkline Bridge Condition	Green	↑	↑
Reduction of Structurally-deficient Trunkline Bridges	Green	↑	↑
Trunkline Pavement Condition Based on Sufficiency	Yellow	↔	↔
Trunkline Pavement Condition Based on International Roughness Index	Green	↑	↔
Trunkline Pavement Condition Based on Remaining Service Life	Green	↓	↑
Trunkline Railroad Crossings	Green	↑	Not Available
Tier 1 Airport Primary Runway Pavements	Yellow	↓	↑
Rural and Specialized Transit Fleet Condition	Red	↓	↔
Level of Intercity Passenger Rail Services	Green	↑	↔
Rural Intercity Bus Access	Green	↔	↔
Level of Local Bus Transit Services	Green	↔	↑
Carpool Lot Condition	Green	↔	↑
Statewide Crash Severity Reduction	Green	↑	↑
Trunkline Crash Severity Reduction	Green	↑	↑
Local Roadway Crash Severity Reduction	No Standard	↑	↑
Safety-funded Project Return on Investment	Green	↔	↑
Road Agencies Serviced with Interoperable Communication Equipment	No Standard	↑	Not Available
Percentage of Program Dollars Spent on Protective Efforts	Green	↔	↔
Acceptable Level of Service on (Inter-)Nationally Significant Corridors	No Standard	↓	↑
Michigan Access Expansion	Green	↔	↑
Manage Traffic Incidents Timely	Green	↓	Not Available

GREEN	Current status is at 90% or greater of target
YELLOW	Current status is between 75% and 90% of target
RED	Current status is less than 75% of target

↑	Condition Improving
↓	Condition Declining
↔	Condition Staying About the Same

Full Screen

On/Off

[Send Feedback](#)

[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Measures Listed by [State Long Range Plan Goal Area](#) *(All measures are links.)*

Stewardship

[Improve and sustain 95% of all freeway bridges in good or fair condition.](#)

[Sustain 85% of all non-freeway bridges on the trunkline system in good or fair condition.](#)

[Reduce the number of trunkline bridges that are structurally deficient.](#)

[Improve or sustain 90% of trunkline pavements in fair or better condition based on Sufficiency.](#)

[Improve or sustain 90% of trunkline pavements in fair or better condition based on International Roughness Index.](#)

[Improve or sustain 90% of trunkline pavements with a Remaining Service Life value of three years or higher.](#)

[Increase the percentage of trunkline railroad crossings that are rated in fair or better condition.](#)

[Maintain 100% of all tier 1 airport primary runway pavements in good or better condition.](#)

[Minimize the portion of the rural transit and the specialized transit fleet that is operating past its useful life.](#)

[Preserve existing intercity passenger rail transportation services.](#)

[Preserve existing rural intercity bus access.](#)

[Preserve existing local bus services including specialized transit service.](#)

[Maintain 90% of all trunkline carpool parking lot pavements in good or fair condition.](#)

Safety and Security

[Reduce crash severity on all roadways, statewide.](#)

[Reduce crash severity on the state trunklines.](#)

[Reduce crash severity on the local roadways.](#)

[Ensure that safety projects provide the maximum return for funding dollars.](#)

[Enhance and increase protective measures and implement effective border continuity.](#)

System Improvement

[Increase percent of route miles along corridors of national/international significance having acceptable level of service.](#)

[Expand MichiVan access.](#)

Efficient and Effective Operations

[Reduce Delays: Minimize disruption to mobility resulting from incidents.](#)

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

► [Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Freeway Bridges

Non-freeway Bridges

Structurally Deficient Bridges

Bridges (Freeway) Condition

AIM:

Improve and sustain 95% of all freeway bridges in good or fair condition.

Measure:

Measured using the National Bridge Inventory ([NBI](#)) rating.

Definition:

The NBI rating scale is 0 to 9, with 9 being best (new condition).

Standard:

Percent of freeway bridges with NBI rating of greater than 4 for the three major bridge elements: deck (item 58), superstructure (item 59), and substructure (item 60).

Status:

Currently, 93.4% of freeway bridges are in good or fair condition.

Last Reported Status:

91.6% of freeway bridges were in good or fair condition.

Click link to view: [Bridges – Freeway Condition Details](#)

IMPORTANT!

USE RESTRICTED: 23 USC 409 and/or 402(k)(1)

Click the link to view [RESTRICTED USE NOTICE](#).

Data is collected within MDOT:	Available throughout the year
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

Full Screen

On/Off

Send Feedback

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

► [Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)


[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Bridges (Freeway) Condition Details

In 1998, our freeway bridge condition was 76.5%. Our condition as of January 30, 2012 is 93.4%. We continue to make steady progress toward the goal of 95% of our bridges in good or fair condition.

Trend projections are updated annually.

Statewide Freeway Bridge Condition



Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

► [Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Freeway Bridges

Non-freeway Bridges

Structurally Deficient Bridges

Bridges (Non-Freeway) Condition

AIM:

Sustain 85% of all non-freeway bridges on the [trunkline](#) system in good or fair condition.

Measure:

Measured using the National Bridge Inventory ([NBI](#)) rating.

Definition:

The NBI rating scale is 0 to 9, with 9 being best (new condition).

Standard:

Percent of non-freeway bridges with NBI rating of greater than 4 for the three major bridge elements: deck (item 58), superstructure (item 59), and substructure (item 60).

Status:

Currently, 92.8% of non-freeway bridges on the trunkline system are in good or fair condition.

Last Reported Status:

92.3% of non-freeway bridges on the trunkline system were in good or fair condition.

Click link to view: [Bridges – Non-Freeway Condition Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	Available throughout the year
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

Full Screen

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

► [Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)


[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Bridges (Non-Freeway) Condition Details

In 1998, our non-freeway [trunkline](#) bridge condition was 79%. Our condition as of January 30, 2012 is 92.8%. We reached the goal of 85% of non-freeway bridges in good or fair condition in 2004. We have sustained the goal since then.

Trend projections are updated annually.

Statewide Non-Freeway Bridge Condition



[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

► [Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Freeway Bridges

Non-freeway Bridges

Structurally Deficient Bridges

Bridges – Structurally Deficient

AIM:

Reduce the number of [trunkline](#) bridges that are structurally deficient.

Measure:

Measured using the National Bridge Inventory ([NBI](#)) rating.

Data is collected within MDOT:	Available throughout the year
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

Definition:

The NBI rating scale is 0 to 9, with 9 being best (new condition).

Standard:

A structurally deficient bridge is a structure in poor to critical condition (NBI rating of 4 or less), or a bridge that has a substandard load rating, or a bridge that has substandard waterway adequacy.

Status:

The number of structurally deficient bridges has been reduced every year since 2000. Based on data current as of January 30, 2012 MDOT has 4,401 highway bridges of which 298 are structurally deficient (6.8%).

Last Reported Status:

Based on data current as of August 23, 2011 MDOT had 4,405 highway bridges of which 361 were structurally deficient (8.2%).

Click link to view: [Bridges – Structurally Deficient Details](#)

Want more information about structurally deficient bridges? This performance measure counts only those bridges that are part of the state [trunkline](#) system and which are owned and maintained by MDOT. Go to Governor Snyder's [MiDashboard](#) to see data about all structurally deficient highway bridges, including those on local and county roads. Link to MiDashboard: <http://www.michigan.gov/midashboard>

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

► [Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)


[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Bridges – Structurally Deficient Details

In 2000, MDOT had a total of 966 structurally deficient (SD) [trunkline](#) bridges. Based on data current as of August 23, 2011 MDOT has 361 structurally deficient bridges. The number of structurally deficient bridges has reduced by 605 bridges. MDOT has 4,405 highway bridges of which 8.2% are structurally deficient. More detailed information may be found in MDOT's [Highway Bridge Report](#).

MDOT Number of Structurally Deficient Bridges



Want more information about structurally deficient bridges? This performance measure counts only those bridges that are part of the state [trunkline](#) system and which are owned and maintained by MDOT. Go to Governor Snyder's [MiDashboard](#) to see data about all structurally deficient highway bridges, including those on local and county roads. Link to MiDashboard: <http://www.michigan.gov/midashboard>

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Trunkline Pavement Condition

Trunkline Ride Quality

Trunkline Remaining Service Life

Trunkline Pavement Condition

AIM:

Improve or sustain 90% of [trunkline](#) pavements in fair or better condition based on Sufficiency.

Measure:

Sufficiency Surface Condition (SSC) rating.

Definition:

- 1 - Excellent: None or very little pavement deterioration.
- 2 - Good: Some initial deterioration not yet requiring appreciable amounts of maintenance.
- 3 - Fair: Occasional deterioration requiring routine maintenance operations.
- 4 - Poor: Frequent occurrence of surface deterioration requiring more extensive maintenance and/or reconstruction.
- 5 - Very Poor: Extensive surface deterioration. Warrants reconstruction soon.

Standard:

90% of trunkline pavements with an SSC rating of fair or better.

Status:

In 2010, 83% of trunkline pavements were in fair or better condition.

Last Reported Status:

83% of trunkline pavements were in fair or better condition in 2009.

IMPORTANT!

USE RESTRICTED: 23 USC 409 and/or 402(k)(1)
Click the link to view [RESTRICTED USE NOTICE](#).

Click link to view: [Trunkline Pavement Condition Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	June
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

► [Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)


[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Trunkline Pavement Condition Details

Statewide Sufficiency Trunkline Pavement Surface Condition



Full Screen

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Trunkline Ride Quality

AIM:

Improve or sustain 90% of [trunkline](#) pavements in fair or better condition.

Measure:

International Roughness Index ([IRI](#)).

Definition:

IRI is an internationally recognized standard measure of pavement roughness. Specially-designed profiler equipment is used to take measurements and calculate IRI based on the amount of vertical deflection along the wheel path on the roadway. For more information, click the IRI link above or the “details” link below.

Good: IRI less than 95 inches per mile.

Fair: IRI between 95 and 170 inches per mile.

Poor: IRI greater than 170 inches per mile.

Standard:

90% of trunkline pavements with an IRI of fair or better.

Status:

94% of trunkline pavement had an IRI of fair or better In 2011.

Last Reported Status:

93% of trunkline pavement had an IRI of fair or better In 2009 and 2010.

92% of trunkline pavement had an IRI of fair or better In 2006, 2007, and 2008.

Click link to view: [Trunkline Ride Quality Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	January
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Trunkline Ride Quality Details

“Developed by University of Michigan engineers at the request of the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) and the World Bank, the International Roughness Index (IRI) is currently used by highway professionals throughout the world as a standard scale to quantify the roughness of roads.


The IRI summarizes the roughness qualities that impact vehicle response (such as vehicle vibration), and is most appropriate when a measure is desired that relates to overall vehicle ride, operating cost, dynamic wheel loads, and overall surface condition. The IRI is determined by measuring the profile along the wheel paths of the road, and then filtering the profiles through an idealized mathematical model to simulate the suspension deflection of a passenger car.”* Several alternative profile-measuring technologies are available and work continues toward better reconciliation and refinement of the results produced among them.

For more information about IRI, see:

*http://www.umtri.umich.edu/content/rr33_1.pdf

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/pavement/ltpp/pubs/05054/chapt4.cfm>

Pavement Ride Quality Details



Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Trunkline Remaining Service Life

AIM:

Improve or sustain 90% of [trunkline](#) pavements with a Remaining Service Life value of three years or higher.

Measure:

Remaining Service Life (RSL).

Definition:

Remaining Service Life is the estimated number of years until a pavement section will reach a level of surface distress where rehabilitation or reconstruction should be seriously considered

Standard:

90% of pavements with an RSL of 3 years or greater

Status:

Currently 89% of pavements have an RSL of 3 years or higher.

Last Reported Status:

As of August 2011, 91% of pavements had an RSL of 3 years or higher. Historical data is provided on Details page.

Click link to view: [Trunkline Remaining Service Life Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	January
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

► [Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)


[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Trunkline Remaining Service Life Details

Remaining service life (RSL) has been variously described as:

- “the time in age or traffic applications from initial construction or reconstruction to first major rehabilitation “
- “the future time and traffic until a critical condition is reached and rehab is performed.”
- “the life remaining in a pavement before a major rehabilitation or reconstruction is the most cost effective fix to apply”
- “the anticipated number of years that a pavement will be functionally and structurally acceptable with only routine maintenance.”

Combined Freeway & Non-Freeway Pavement Condition



Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

► [Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Trunkline Highway – Railroad Crossings

AIM:

Increase the percentage of [trunkline](#) railroad crossings that are rated in fair or better condition.

Measure:

Crossing Condition Index (CCI).

Definition:

The CCI rates surfaces on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the best condition and 5 being the worst condition. A good crossing surface has a rating of 2 on the CCI rating system.

Standard:

90% of trunkline highway-railroad crossings rated equal to or better than good or fair condition.

Status:

89.8% of trunkline highway-railroad crossings are in fair or better condition, as of September 30, 2011.

Last Reported Status:

As of September 2010, 86.5% of trunkline highway-railroad crossings were in fair or better condition, and 82% were in fair or better condition in 2009.

Click link to view: [Trunkline Highway – Railroad Crossings Details](#)

IMPORTANT!

USE RESTRICTED: 23 USC 409 and/or 402(k)(1)
Click the link to view [RESTRICTED USE NOTICE](#).

Data is collected within MDOT:	September
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March*

***This measure was updated in October 2011 and may not be updated again until Fall 2012.**

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)


[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Trunkline Highway – Railroad Crossings Details

Trunkline crossing surface condition is measurable every two years by collecting data on one-half of the system every year. Prior to 2003, the crossing surface condition evaluation was performed by a consultant and delivered as a report to the Trunkline Crossing Program. In 2003, the responsibility for collecting crossing surface conditions was shifted to MDOT's Rail Safety Section. The data is still measured every two years by collecting data on one-half of the system every year. The surface condition rating is now included within an "on-site inspection" form and it requires a review of archived records to produce appropriate results for the period between 2003-2007. (Note: this effort is ongoing and this chart will be updated as soon as possible.) Starting in 2008 data is available from the current on-site inspection data.

TRUNKLINE HIGHWAY-RAILROAD GRADE CROSSING SURFACE CONDITIONS



[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

► [Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Airport Pavement

AIM:

Maintain 100% of all [tier 1](#) airport primary runway pavements in good or better condition.

Measure:

Pavement Condition Index ([PCI](#)).

Definition:

The PCI is a rating of the surface condition of a pavement and measures functional performance. The PCI provides a measure of the present condition of the pavement based on the distress observed on the surface of the pavement. PCI is rated on a scale of 0 to 100.

Standard:

100% of Tier 1 airport primary runways having PCI ratings equal to good or better condition.

Status:

As of December 2011, 86% of Tier 1 airport primary runways were in good or better condition.

Last Reported Status:

As of December 2010, 87% of Tier 1 airport primary runways were in good or better condition.

Click link to view: [Airport Pavement Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	June - August
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

► [Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)


[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Airport Pavement Details

Pavement Condition Index is based on pavement condition survey procedures as documented in the U.S. FAA Advisory Circular 150/5380-6A, Guidelines and Procedures for Maintenance of Airport Pavements, and ASTM Standard D5340, Standard Test Method for Airport Pavement Condition Index Surveys. This data is collected every three years on every [tier 1](#) airport runway pavement by collecting data on one-third of the system every year. Previously, data was collected in 2000 and again in 2008. 2008 will be the baseline year for data and trend reporting, and data will now be compiled and reported every year. The data is published in the Michigan Airport System Plan ([MASP](#)), which is available online.

The data is compiled manually and does not currently exist in any management system.

Tier 1 Airport Primary Runway Pavement Condition



[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

► [Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Bus Fleet Condition

Passenger Rail Service

Rural Intercity Bus Access

Local Bus Transit Service

AIM:

Minimize the portion of the rural transit and the specialized transit fleet that is operating past its useful life.

Measure:

The highest percentage of any one rural or specialized transit agency's fleet that is past its useful life.

Definition:

"Useful life" is based on the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) definitions.

Standard:

0% of bus fleet past its useful life – Desirable.

Less than 20% of bus fleet past its useful life – Acceptable.

Status:

As of April 1, 2011, taking into account buses that will be replaced with funding approved through FY2011, including federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds,* the highest percentage of buses past their useful lives for any one agency is 27%.

Last Reported Status:

As of April 1, 2009, taking into account buses that would be replaced with funding approved through FY2010*, including federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds, the highest percentage of buses past their useful lives for any one agency was 15%.

* It can take one to three years after funding has been approved for a bus to be replaced.

Buses:	
Cutaway - Light duty	5 years or 150,000 miles
Medium duty	7 years or 200,000 miles
Medium Heavy duty	10 years or 350,000 miles
Large Heavy duty	12 years or 500,000 miles
Trucks:	
Light duty	4 years
Heavy duty	7 years
Smaller Vehicles:	
Cars, Minivans, Maxivan, Van Conversion	4 years or 100,000 miles

Click link to view: [Preserve Bus Fleet Condition Details](#)

IMPORTANT!

USE RESTRICTED: 23 USC 409 and/or 402(k)(1)

Click the link to view [RESTRICTED USE NOTICE](#).

Data is collected
within MDOT:
Data is Updated
on this website:

February - April

August/September

Full Screen

On/Off

Send Feedback

[Home](#) [Back](#) [Zoom](#)

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

► [Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)


[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Bus Fleet Condition - Data Detail

Bus Fleet Condition - Program Detail



** Based on the rural or specialized transit agency with the largest percentage of vehicles past their useful life. In the last five years, all specialized vehicles have been replaced as they meet their useful life based on miles and years, so the percentages represent the rural fleet only.*

*** As of August 2011. Not all federal discretionary awards for FY2011 have been made and the condition for FY2011 will improve if MDOT receives federal funds for rural vehicle replacements.*

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

► [Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Explanation of Bus Transit Fleet Condition

The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) receives federal funds under the Section 5310 program every year for the replacement transit vehicles used by non-profit agencies and others for demand-response specialized transportation services that are aimed at the elderly and persons with disabilities.* These funds can only be used for capital projects, such as vehicle replacements.

MDOT also receives federal funds every year under the Section 5311 program that can be used for operating assistance or capital projects, including vehicle replacement, for general public rural transit services. Since 2005, MDOT has used its entire section 5311 apportionment for operating assistance. In some years, MDOT may also receive discretionary funds awarded for specific projects, such as rural bus replacements.

When federal funding is available under either of these two programs for vehicle replacements, MDOT allocates the funds among all the eligible agencies that have vehicles eligible for replacement based on their useful life (vehicle age and/or miles). MDOT allocates these funds using an asset management process that is aimed at ensuring no one agency has more than 20% of their total fleet past its useful life. Therefore, the agency with the largest percent of vehicles past their useful life is used as the indicator of the overall condition of the rural and specialized transit fleet.

From year to year, the rural fleet condition is largely a function of the amount of federal funds MDOT has available to allocate for vehicle replacement. Since MDOT allocates all of its routine annual funding for operating assistance, improvement of the rural transit fleet has been dependent on MDOT receiving federal discretionary grant awards for vehicle replacement. When MDOT has discretionary funds available, the condition of the fleet improves. Improvements made in FY 2010 are a result of the capital funds MDOT received under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

From year to year, the specialized fleet condition is largely a function of the number of vehicles eligible for replacement in contrast to the annual federal grant. In the last five years, MDOT has been able to replace all specialized vehicles as they become eligible for replacement, and therefore none of the specialized fleet has been past its useful life.

For urban transit agencies, federal funds are awarded directly to individual transit agencies and each individual agency determines how the funds will be used each year and whether or not vehicles will be replaced. Therefore, there is not a statewide standard used to measure the condition of the urban transit fleet.

**does not include Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandated paratransit services
that supplement fixed route services*

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

► [Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

AIM:

Preserve existing intercity passenger rail transportation services.

Measure:

- 1) Number of daily train miles.
- 2) Total annual ridership.

Definition:

- 1) Train miles traveled each day along designated routes.
- 2) Total number of passengers using state-supported passenger rail services.

Standard:

- 1) Maintain minimum of one round-trip daily service from Port Huron to Chicago and Grand Rapids to Chicago.
- 2) Maintain ridership based on national reporting for state-supported service, with Michigan ridership trends consistent with (within 10%) or better than national trends.

Status:

As of February 2012, the standard is being met.

Last Reported Status:

No change since last report.

Click link to view: [Preserve Existing Passenger Rail Service Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	Available throughout the year
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Full Screen

On/Off

Send Feedback

Train Mile Details

Ridership Details

Preserve Existing Passenger Rail Services – Train Miles Details


MDOT is currently maintaining one round-trip daily service from Port Huron to Chicago and Grand Rapids to Chicago through state contracts with Amtrak. The data is collected by Amtrak and submitted to MDOT.

Pere Marquette (Grand Rapids to Chicago) is 352 train miles (176 miles one way) and runs every day of the year (365 days). In FY2008, it is reported that 128,656 total miles were traveled (352/day).

Blue Water (Port Huron to Chicago) is 638 train miles (319 miles one way) and runs every day of the year (365 days). In FY2008, it is reported that 233,189 total miles were traveled (638/day).

Click link to view online high-resolution pdf version:

[Passenger Rail Service Map](#)



[Home](#) [Back](#) [Zoom](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

► [Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)


Train Mile Details

Ridership Details

Fiscal Year	Amtrak Nationwide		Michigan State-Supported Routes				Standard* Being Met?
	Ridership	Percent Change	Blue Water Ridership	Pere Marquette Ridership	Total Michigan Ridership	Percent Change	
2005	10,663,938		111,630	96,471	208,101		
2006	11,144,430	4.5%	123,823	101,932	225,755	8.5%	YES
2007	11,993,252	7.6%	127,642	104,819	232,461	3.0%	YES
2008	13,648,196	13.8%	136,538	111,716	248,254	6.8%	YES
2009	13,022,237	-4.6%	132,851	103,246	236,097	-4.9%	YES
2010	13,866,804	6.5%	157,709	101,907	259,616	10.0%	YES
2011	14,765,011	6.5%	187,065	106,662	293,727	13.1%	YES

* Standard: Michigan ridership trend consistent with or better than national ridership trend. If the change in Michigan is within ten percentage points of the change nationwide, the trends are considered consistent.

Passenger Rail Ridership Trends
Michigan State-Supported Routes and Amtrak Nationwide



Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

► [Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Rural Intercity Bus Service Access

AIM:

Preserve existing intercity bus passenger transportation bus services.

Measure:

Percent of Michigan's rural population with access to an intercity bus stop.

Definition:

Population of the state within 25 miles of an intercity bus stop.

Standard:

Maintain statewide access to national intercity bus transportation system, defined as the percentage of the rural population that is within 25 miles of an intercity bus stop in Michigan.

Status

Currently we have 81% of the rural population within 25 miles of an intercity bus stop.
The national average is 78%.

Last Reported Status:

As of June 2011, 81% of the population of Michigan lived within 25 miles of an intercity bus stop.

Click link to view: [Rural Intercity Bus Access Preservation Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	June
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Rural Access Details

Ridership And Miles Details


Rural Intercity Bus Service Access Preservation

Prior to August 2011, MDOT measured intercity bus level of service in terms of the percent of the state's population within 100 miles of an intercity bus route. Starting in August 2011, MDOT shifted to a national standard, the percent of rural population within 25 miles of an intercity bus stop. This shift allows us to compare Michigan's rural intercity bus service to the service levels in other states, using a national report issued in 2011.* According to the national report, 90% of Michigan's rural population has access (is within 25 miles) of an intercity bus stop. The map at the right shows the rural population that has access to intercity bus stops in Michigan. This map was generated using more refined, and more current data than was used in the national study. According to MDOT generated data, 81% of Michigan's rural population has access to an intercity bus stop.

* [The US Rural Population and Scheduled Intercity Transportation in 2010: A Five-Year Decline in Transportation Access](#)

Michigan Total Population (Caliper Corporation, June 2011)	9,883,640
Total Population within service area.	9,219,131
Total Urban Population within service area.	7,231,171
Total Rural Population within service area.	1,987,960
Percentage of rural residents within service area	81%

Service Area is defined as a 25 miles radius from each Bus/Flag Stop. 109 Bus / Flag stops on the Michigan Network



Click link to view online full-resolution version:
[Passenger Intercity Bus Coverage Map](#)

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

► [Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)


[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Rural Intercity Bus Service Access Preservation

Currently, 81% of the state's population is within 25 miles of an intercity bus stop. MDOT contracts for intercity bus service in rural areas of Michigan, to supplement the service provided by the private marketplace. Without these contracts, the northern lower peninsula and entire upper peninsula would not have the ability to use public transportation to access the state and national intercity bus and rail network. MDOT contracts for five routes.

State Subsidized Intercity Bus Routes: Annual Miles and Ridership



Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Existing Local Bus Transit Service Preservation

AIM:

Preserve existing local bus services including specialized transit service.

Measure:

Level of Service, using five indicators.

Definition:

Level of service indicators include:

1. Some form of local transit in all 83 counties
2. Total Annual Passenger Trips
3. Total Annual Passenger Trips for Seniors and Persons With Disabilities
4. Total Hours of Service
5. Total Miles of Service

Standard:

Maintain level of service using all five indicators.

Status:

For 2010:	Total Annual Passenger Trips:	97,526,236
	Total Annual Passenger Trips for Seniors and Persons With Disabilities (a subset of total trips):	12,909,367
	Total Hours of Service:	6,548,547
	Total Miles of Service:	105,102,288
	Some form of local transit in all 83 counties:	Yes

Last Reported Status:

In the prior report, the only indicator was transit service in all 83 counties and for that indicator there is no change. For the 4 new indicators, there were declines between 2009 and 2010, as can be seen on the "details" pages.

Click link to view: [Preserve Existing Local Bus Transit Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	April
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)


Indicator #1: Some form of local transit in all 83 counties.

Currently, MDOT provides financial assistance for operating some form of public transportation in all 83 counties, which is an indicator that local bus transit exists in all 83 counties.

Click [HERE](#) for additional indicators
 (or see the next tab).

Click link to view online high-resolution
 pdf version:

[Michigan Local Public Transit Map](#)



* The Specialized Service program provides financial assistance for operating transportation services primarily for elderly persons and individuals with disabilities.

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

► [Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)


[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Additional Indicators (#2 through #5 – see previous tab for indicator #1):

- Total Annual Passenger Trips
- Total Annual Passenger Trips for Seniors and Persons With Disabilities
- Total Hours of Service
- Total Miles of Service

**Local Transit Level of Service
FY2006-FY2010**



Passenger Trips Total	939211667	95175990	101849957	101217334	97526236
Elderly and Disabled Passenger Trips (as subset of Total)	19419606	10780664	13222791	13287532	12909367
Hours of Service	5959768	6216063	6811329	6673897	6548547
Miles of Service	102133516	103790615	110382367	108816524	105102288

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

► [Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Carpool Parking Lot Pavement Condition

AIM:

Maintain 90% of all [trunkline](#) carpool parking lot pavements in good or fair condition.

Measure:

[PASER](#) rating.

Definition:

Rating Scale		
Rating	Label	Definition
8 to 10	Good	Requires only routine maintenance
5 to 7	Fair	Requires capital preventive maintenance to reach good condition
1 to 4	Poor	Requires structural improvement to reach good condition

Standard:

90% in good or fair condition.

Status:

Currently, 96% of carpool lot pavements are in good or fair condition.

Last Reported Status:

96% of carpool lot pavements were in good or fair condition.

Click link to view: [Carpool Parking Lot Condition Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	June - July
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

► [Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)


[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Carpool Parking Lot Condition Details

The condition of MDOT [trunkline](#) carpool lots statewide has improved from approximately 70% good or fair in 2006 to approximately 96% good or fair in 2010 and 2011. MDOT has met its objective of improving the carpool lot pavement condition to 90%.



[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

► [Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Statewide Crash Reduction

Trunkline Crash Reduction

Local Crash Reduction

AIM:

Reduce crash severity on all roadways, statewide (Reduce fatality and injury crashes).

Measure:

Occurrences (#) per year (fatalities and serious injuries on all roadways, statewide).

Definition:

Reportable fatalities and injuries as defined by the [Michigan Vehicle Code](#) and occurring on all roadways, statewide.

Standard:



Reduce fatalities and serious injuries from 1,084 and 7,485 in 2007 to no more than 850 and 5,900 in 2012. This equates to an approximate 5% reduction per year. [Strategic Highway Safety Plan ([SHSP](#)) goals]

Status:

937 Fatalities in 2010, a 7.6% increase from 871 in 2009.
 5,980 Serious Injuries in 2010, an 8.2% reduction from 6,511 in 2009.

Data is collected within MDOT:	April
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

Last Reported Status: See charts below:



Click link to view: [Statewide Crash Reduction Details](#)

Data updated annually, 3 months after end of previous year.

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

► [Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Statewide Crash Details

Statewide Crash Costs

Statewide Crash Types

Statewide Crash Reduction Details

This performance measure is an overall indicator of performance measures for fatalities and serious injuries statewide in five focus areas: Intersections, Lane Departure, Pedestrians and Bicycles, Railroad Grade Crossings, and Work Zones.

The goal of Michigan's 2008 [Strategic Highway Safety Plan](#) (SHSP) is to reduce statewide traffic fatalities and serious injuries from 1,084 and 7,485 in 2007 to no more than 850 and 5,900 in 2012.

Michigan Fatalities and Serious Injuries 2006-2010

	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries
Year	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010	2010
Intersection	281	2,594	293	2,469	249	2,142	242	2,257	269	2082
Lane Departure	546	2,951	530	2,950	498	2,682	414	2,508	436	2314
Ped/Bike	167	735	156	698	140	647	145	652	163	586
RR Xing	6	5	3	9	4	4	3	10	3	11
Work Zone	18	113	21	108	13	91	19	99	23	105
All Crashes	1,084	7,618	1,084	7,485	980	6,725	871	6,511	937	5,980

Crashes can be in multiple emphasis areas.

Data updated annually, 3 months after end of previous year.

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)


Societal Cost of Crashes in Michigan Statewide

The cost estimate for Michigan crashes from 2005 to 2009 is based on the National Safety Council's cost estimating procedures. Average comprehensive costs are determined for:

- Death,
- Incapacitating injury,
- Nonincapacitating evident injury,
- Possible injury, and
- No injury.

Deaths and injuries are calculated by number of persons. "No injury" is calculated per crash.

Traffic Crash Economic Loss



http://www.nsc.org/news_resources/injury_and_death_statistics/Pages/EstimatingtheCostsofUnintentionalInjuries.aspx

Data released annually in September by Michigan State Police Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP).

[Overview »](#)
[Condition Trends »](#)
[Measures by Goal Area »](#)
[Trunkline Bridges](#)
[Trunkline Pavement](#)
[Railroads](#)
[Airport Pavement](#)
[Passenger Transportation](#)
[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)
 [Crash Reduction](#)
[Safety Cost Savings](#)
[Risk/Vulnerability](#)
[Facilities Modernization](#)
[Access Expansion](#)
[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Major Crash Types in Michigan Statewide

The following tables show the major crash types for fatal and serious injury crashes in Michigan between 2004 and 2009.

Statewide Fatal Crashes

Crash Type	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	% Difference 2004-09
Single Vehicle	501	483	522	490	471	409	18.4%
Head On	156	146	146	139	132	101	35.3%
Head On - Left Turn	40	32	47	37	33	36	10.0%
Angle	204	219	168	188	170	153	25.0%
Rear End	65	64	47	53	47	43	33.8%
Rear End - Left Turn	6	5	5	7	2	3	
Rear End - Right Turn	0	2	1	3	0	1	
Sideswipe - Same Direction	11	20	12	14	19	18	-63.6%
Sideswipe - Opposite Direct	23	16	12	12	11	9	60.9%
Other/Unknown	49	43	42	44	30	33	32.7%

Statewide Serious Injury Crashes

Crash Type	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	% Difference 2004-09
Single Vehicle	2,911	2,963	2,736	2,685	2,551	2,427	16.6%
Head On	521	405	355	368	322	297	43.0%
Head On - Left Turn	445	343	309	333	249	255	42.7%
Angle	1,907	1,682	1,383	1,326	1,164	1,159	39.2%
Rear End	846	738	661	614	562	578	31.7%
Rear End - Left Turn	76	71	47	51	53	49	35.5%
Rear End - Right Turn	18	14	13	14	18	21	-16.7%
Sideswipe - Same Direction	177	176	168	168	153	146	17.5%
Sideswipe - Opposite Direct	123	106	104	83	81	86	30.1%
Other/Unknown	366	302	272	295	258	215	41.3%

Data released annually in July by Michigan State Police Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP).

[Home](#) [Back](#) [Zoom](#)

Statewide Crash Reduction

Trunkline Crash Reduction

Local Crash Reduction

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

AIM:

Reduce crash severity on the state [trunklines](#). (Reduce fatality and injury crashes.)

Measure:

Occurrences (#) per year (fatalities and serious injuries on state trunklines).

Definition:

Reportable fatalities and injuries as defined by the [Michigan Vehicle Code](#) and occurring on state trunklines.

Standard:

Reduce fatalities and serious injuries from 453 and 3,009 in 2007 to no more than 250 and 1,700 in 2012. This equates to an approximate 11% reduction per year. While this is the goal for 2012 on the state trunkline, MDOT's vision is Toward Zero Deaths (TZD). Our ultimate goal is to reduce fatalities to zero and minimize serious injuries. The 2012 goal is the interim goal of our vision.


Status:

386 Fatalities in 2010, a 6.3% increase from 363 in 2009.


2,346 Serious Injuries in 2010, a 9.6% reduction from 2,596 in 2009.

Last Reported Status: See charts below:

Data is collected within MDOT:	April
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September



Click link to view: [Trunkline Crash Reduction Details](#)



Data updated annually, 3 months after end of previous year.

Full Screen

On/Off

Send Feedback

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Trunkline Crash Reduction Details

This performance measure is an overall indicator of performance measures for fatalities and serious injuries on the state [trunkline](#) system in five focus areas: Intersections, Lane Departure, Pedestrians and Bicycles, Railroad Grade Crossings, and Work Zones.

The goal of Michigan's 2008 [Strategic Highway Safety Plan](#) (SHSP) is to reduce statewide traffic fatalities and serious injuries from 1,084 and 7,485 in 2007 to no more than 850 and 5,900 in 2012. The trunkline goal is a component of the statewide goal.

Michigan Trunkline Fatalities and Serious Injuries 2006-2010

	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries
Year	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010	2010
Intersection	103	953	101	895	86	747	84	856	98	778
Lane Departure	227	1,089	206	1,109	221	1,045	172	938	160	807
Ped/Bike	67	206	74	225	62	215	62	195	70	187
RR Xing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Work Zone	12	84	14	82	8	55	13	66	18	84
All Trunkline	458	3,038	453	3,009	421	2,663	363	2,596	386	2,346

Crashes can be in multiple emphasis areas.

Data released annually by Michigan State Police Office of Highway Safety Planning (OHSP).

[Home](#) [Back](#) [Zoom](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

► [Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Statewide Crash Reduction

Trunkline Crash Reduction

Local Crash Reduction

AIM:

Reduce crash severity on the local roadways. (Reduce fatality and injury and crashes.)

Measure:

Occurrences (#) per year (fatalities and serious injuries on local roadways).

Definition:

Reportable fatalities and injuries as defined by the [Michigan Vehicle Code](#) and occurring on local roadways.

Status:


550 Fatalities in 2010, an 8.3% increase from 508 in 2009.

3,618 Serious Injuries in 2010, a 6.9% reduction from 3,888 in 2009.


Data is collected within MDOT:	April
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

Last Reported Status: See charts below:

Local Fatalities



Local Serious Injuries



Click link to view: [Local Crash Reduction Details](#)

Data updated annually, 3 months after end of previous year.

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

► [Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Local Crash Reduction Details

This performance measure is an overall indicator of performance measures for fatalities and serious injuries on local roadways in five focus areas: Intersections, Lane Departure, Pedestrians and Bicycles, Railroad Grade Crossings, and Work Zones.

The goal of Michigan's 2008 [Strategic Highway Safety Plan](#) (SHSP) is to reduce statewide traffic fatalities and serious injuries from 1,084 and 7,485 in 2007 to no more than 850 and 5,900 in 2012.

Michigan Non-Trunkline Fatalities and Serious Injuries 2006-2010

	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries	Fatalities	Serious Injuries
Year	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010	2010
Intersection	179	1,632	188	1,565	163	1,391	158	1,397	171	1301
Lane Departure	318	1,845	324	1,822	277	1,617	242	1,554	276	1498
Ped/Bike	100	523	80	470	78	432	83	454	92	398
RR Xing	6	5	3	9	4	4	3	10	3	10
Work Zone	6	29	6	27	5	36	6	33	5	21
All Non-trunkline	625	4,549	629	4,442	559	4,033	508	3,888	550	3,618

Crashes can be in multiple emphasis areas.

Data updated annually, 3 months after end of previous year.

[Home](#) [Back](#) [Zoom](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

► [Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Cost Savings From Safety Investments

AIM:

Ensure that safety projects provide the maximum return for funding dollars.

Measures:

Time-of-Return (TOR) of safety-funded projects.

Definition:

Average TOR for state trunkline safety improvement projects.


Standard:

Goal - Maintain TOR of safety-funded projects at 5.0 years or less.

Status:

The statewide average TOR has met the goal of 5.0 years or less for each of the last five fiscal years.

Last Reported Status: See chart below:



Click link to view: [Cost Savings From Safety Investments Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	July
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

Data updated annually, in July, for three latest years of programmed safety projects.

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

► [Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Cost Savings From Safety Investments Details

Time-of-Return for Safety-Funded Improvements

The use of a cost/benefit analysis (time-of-return) for selection of safety-related projects is required by the Highway Safety Improvement Program. The funding criteria of 7 years for stand-alone safety projects and 10 years for safety-related improvements with other road construction is stipulated in the process and agreed upon by FHWA for use of federal funds for safety-related improvements.

Safety-related projects have been selected and analyzed for time-of-return through FY 2014 .

This performance measure is an average of seven performance measures for time-of-return by MDOT Region. The breakdown of time-of-return by MDOT Region is shown in the table below.

<i>MDOT Region</i>	<i>FY 2010</i>	<i>FY 2011</i>	<i>FY 2012</i>	<i>FY 2013</i>	<i>FY 2014</i>
Superior	3.0	2.7	5.1	3.5	5.9
North	10.0	5.9	7.4	5.1	2.7
Grand	4.0	0.0	3.5	4.4	2.4
Bay	4.9	1.9	5.3	4.4	5.6
Southwest	2.7	9.5	9.8	4.2	5.8
University	9.9	5.8	3.7	3.4	3.2
Metro	3.3	7.7	3.8	3.5	0.5
<i>Statewide</i>	4.1	4.1	4.5	3.9	3.0

Data updated annually, in July, for three latest years of programmed safety projects.

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

▶ [Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Interoperability

Protective Efforts

Reduce Risk and Vulnerability - Interoperability

AIM:

Enhance and increase protective measures and implement effective border continuity by:

- *Enhancing the ability to protect transportation facilities and mitigate vulnerabilities for all modes of transportation by increasing the number of interoperable communication equipment used by transportation agencies.*

Measure:

Total number of public road agencies serviced with interoperability talk group channels with MDOT (form 0184).

Definition:

The Michigan Public Safety Communications System (MPSCS) defines the interoperable communication requirements and talk group channels.

Standard:

MDOT uses and complies with the Michigan Interoperable Communications Plan standards.

Status:

Ongoing.* 73% of county-level road agencies are serviced by interoperable talk group channels with MDOT.

Last Reported Status:

48% of county-level road agencies were serviced by interoperable talk group channels with MDOT.

**As this program is unfolding, MDOT is linked to some counties through their 911 dispatch instead of directly to the county road commission.*

Please Note!

For security reasons, some Risk/Vulnerability information cannot be shared. Contact the [Michigan State Police, Emergency Mgmt. & Homeland Security Division](#) for further details.

Click link to view:

[Vulnerability Reduction and Risk Management Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	January
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

► [Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Vulnerability Reduction

Risk Management

[Reduce Vulnerability Details](#)

Enhancing and Increasing Protective Measures

MDOT addresses all modes of transportation and types of preparedness to deal with security and emergency situations caused by "all hazards." The term "all hazards" (or multiple hazards) includes any incident, disaster or attack. The incident could be man-made (technological, act of terrorism), or an act of nature, such as flooding, fog, or major snow and ice storms. It includes programs such as emergency response to crashes and weather events; programs, strategies, and activities focused on terrorism and acts of destruction; as well as programs, strategies, and activities designed to address multiple hazards. MDOT tracks all grant program dollars towards these efforts.

MDOT has been involved in the state's traditional emergency management for more than 50 years. Early programs included the "civil defense plans." Following the events of September 11, 2001, MDOT updated and expanded its emergency preparedness programs and security role to cover all modes of transportation through the Transportation Risk Assessment and Protection (TransRAP) Team. The TransRAP Team also serves as the transportation subcommittee of the Michigan Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) Committee, an advisory panel reporting to the Michigan Homeland Protection Board created by Gov. Granholm through Executive Order 2003-06.

MDOT's transportation security programs, strategies, and activities go beyond "guards and gates;" they are a multi-layered, "all hazards" approach. In general, MDOT's strategy is to prevent, respond, and recover. MDOT's strategy includes identifying potential targets (such as key bridges and high-volume roadways or transit facilities), working with its partners to assess and correct weaknesses, developing programs to strengthen and protect potential targets and points of entry into the state, and quickly and efficiently responding to and recovering from all hazards. One initiative in state preparedness is interoperable communications. MDOT is coordinating efforts and providing access to interoperable talk group channels with public road agencies or their dispatch centers.

The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) visited Michigan as part of a national effort and was impressed with the risk and vulnerability assessments of the transportation infrastructure performed in the state, primarily at border crossings. This included MDOT's knowledge and awareness of the strengths, as well as weaknesses, involving these structures. The TSA also was pleased with the high level of communication and cooperation between state agencies, especially the interoperability between MDOT and Michigan State Police (MSP). This cooperation is not only fostered through homeland security discussions, but especially concerning emergency management issues.

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

► [Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Interoperability

Protective Efforts

AIM:

Enhance and increase protective efforts and implement effective border continuity by:

- Tracking funding used to address significant critical infrastructure issues and improve transportation infrastructure protection and resiliency at the international border including hazardous materials freight movement..

Measure:

Percentage of program dollars spent on protective efforts.

Definitions:

The United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is a primary funding source for building and sustaining national preparedness capabilities through grant programs. The Michigan State Police (MSP) administer these grant programs on behalf of the State of Michigan.

Standards:

DHS requires MDOT comply with grant Program standards and requirements.

Status:

Ongoing. MDOT spent nearly 100% of grant dollars awarded through the 2007 grant cycle.

Last Reported Status: See chart at right:


Please Note!

For security reasons, some Risk/Vulnerability information cannot be shared. Contact the [Michigan State Police, Emergency Mgmt. & Homeland Security Division](#) for further details.

Data is collected within MDOT:	January
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March

Homeland Security Related Grant Funds Awarded to MDOT

Percentage of Grant Dollars Spent



*Grant period remains open.

Compiled and Created by MDOT Safety and Security Administration updated 1/2012

Click link to view: [Vulnerability Reduction and Risk Management Details](#)

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

► [Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Vulnerability Reduction

Risk Management

Risk Management Details

Trunkline Safety Program

Enhancing and Increasing Protective Measures

Programs, strategies, and activities to implement effective methods to improve transportation infrastructure protection and resiliency at the international border; track open source events and determine reporting status by week; enhance the ability to determine risk and vulnerabilities relation to motor carriers to ensure continuity of hazardous materials freight movement across borders.

- MDOT actively participates in the protection of critical infrastructure, in cooperation with state, local, and federal agency partners in homeland security.
- MDOT conducted risk assessments at key MDOT-owned international border bridges. As a result of that work:
 1. A list of the most important needs relating to homeland security was identified.
 2. MDOT supplied information to the Michigan State Police (MSP), Military and Veterans Affairs (MVA), as well as the governor's office in Washington, reflecting the needs relating to the funding structure for domestic preparedness.
 3. Action plans that respond to U.S. Department of Homeland Security terrorist threat levels have been developed and are in place at key MDOT-owned bridges.
- The original assessments from the border security risk assessments and action plan defined a strong path to follow. The federal team validated and verified the results.
- The top priority recommended for both international bridges includes the surveillance system and security enhancements. MDOT requested that the state administrative agency at MSP grant MDOT \$1.25 million (each) for physical security enhancements at the Blue Water International bridges. These physical security enhancements are critical in addressing homeland security preparedness.
- MDOT recently completed a second round of security assessments for the International Bridge and the Blue Water Bridge with partners from the federal government. Members of the federal team included previous Navy SEALs, Army tactical specialists, and economic specialists. These bridges are critical to Michigan's economy and national security. Each of the bridges received high marks from the team.
- The result of this second round study was the development of a plan for security improvements to these two structures for which additional federal funding is needed.
- MDOT continues to improve the protection, collaboration and coordination with homeland security agencies in the development, construction, and operation of border facilities
- MDOT continues to develop and improve our tracking methods of open source events to manage possible increase in risk.
- MDOT continues to work with its partners who enforce regulations relative to transporting hazardous materials.

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

► [Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Level Of Service (LOS)

AIM:

Modernize facilities to accommodate the efficient movement of people, goods and services.

Measure:

Percent of Route Miles along Corridors of National/International Significance Operating at an Acceptable Level of Service (LOS).

Definition:

Level of Service – a quality measure using a letter rating scale from A to F, where LOS A represents the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst. Click here for [map and examples](#).

Standard:

Acceptable LOS – Roadways having acceptable level of service are either “uncongested” or “approaching congested.” (See the map and examples for details.)

- Uncongested: LOS A – C for both freeways and non-freeways
- Approaching Congested: LOS D for non-freeways and LOS D – E for freeways
- Congested: LOS E – F for non-freeways and LOS F for freeways

Status:

97.1% of route miles along corridors of national/international significance at an acceptable LOS (2010).

Last Reported Status:

97.8% of route miles along corridors of national/international significance were at an acceptable LOS (2009).

Click link to view: [Level of Service Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	August
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March

[Home](#) [Back](#) [Zoom](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

► [Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Map of Major Corridors

Level of Service Examples

Click link to view online high-resolution pdf version (in State Long-Range Transportation Plan corridor report):

[Michigan Corridors of Highest Significance Map](#)



Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

LEVEL OF SERVICE EXAMPLES

Level of Service (LOS) is a qualitative measure that describes traffic conditions in terms of speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, comfort, convenience, traffic interruptions, and safety. Six classifications are used to define LOS, designated by the letters A through F. LOS A represents the best conditions, while LOS F represents heavily congested flow with traffic demand exceeding highway capacity. The photo simulations to the right illustrate the various classifications.



Level of Service "A"



Level of Service "B"



Level of Service "C"



Level of Service "D"



Level of Service "E"



Level of Service "F"

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

► [Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

LOS Cost-to-Cure

LOS Data

LOS Definitions

LOS Trends

**Percent of Route Miles along Corridors of National/International Significance
Operating at an Acceptable Level of Service (LOS) Details (1 of 4)**

Cost to Cure

The table shown below presents the estimated cost to cure congestion on the *entire* **trunkline** system based upon 2010 congestion levels and an estimated 2011 cost of constructing additional lanes.

	Statewide Congested Lane Miles (2010*)				
	Rural		Urban		
	Freeway	Non-Freeway	Freeway	Non-Freeway	Total
Lane Miles	0.00	38.72	88.36	316.04	443.12
\$ millions	\$0	\$183	\$2,043	\$1,770	\$3,995

•Most current estimate.

**This Cost to Cure data is for the entire trunkline system, and represents the total new lane miles needed to fix the congestion; while the LOS status (and the LOS Trends tab) only show data for the National/International and Statewide Corridors of Highest Significance (COHS), which account for 46% of trunkline miles.

[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

LOS Cost-to-Cure

LOS Data

LOS Definitions

LOS Trends

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

► [Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

**Percent of Route Miles along Corridors of National/International Significance
Operating at an Acceptable Level of Service (LOS) Details (2 of 4)**

Correlation to Michigan Transportation Plan Goals:

This measure supports efforts to modernize facilities to accommodate the efficient movement of people, goods and services.

This measure is used to monitor congestion trends for primary roadways that traverse the length of corridors of national or international significance as designated in [Mi Transportation Plan](#) (the State Long-Range Transportation Plan). All of the subject roadways are freeways except US-2.

Data:

This measure uses annual Sufficiency LOS ratings, and data are available by region or statewide for all state long range plan classified corridors – national/international, statewide, regional, and local.

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

► [Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Percent of Route Miles along Corridors of National/International Significance Operating at an Acceptable Level of Service (LOS) Details (3 of 4)

Definitions:

Level of Service—a quality measure using a letter rating scale from A to F, where LOS A represents the best operating conditions and LOS F, the worst. LOS ratings are defined as:

- **LOS A:** Free flow operations.
- **LOS B:** Reasonably free flow operations.
- **LOS C:** Provides for free flow of traffic with speeds still at or near free flow. Maneuvering within traffic stream is noticeably restricted.
- **LOS D:** Level of traffic volume at which speeds decline slightly, density begins to increase.
- **LOS E:** Describes operations at capacity. Operations are volatile due to no usable gaps in the traffic stream.
- **LOS F:** Breakdown in vehicular flow. Traffic volume exceeds roadway capacity.

[Home](#) [Back](#) [Zoom](#)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

► [Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)


LOS Cost-to-Cure

LOS Data

LOS Definitions

LOS Trends

**Percent of Route Miles along Corridors of National/International Significance
Operating at an Acceptable Level of Service (LOS) Details (4 of 4)**



Full Screen

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

► [Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

MichiVan Access

AIM:

Expand transportation system (MichiVan) access.

Measure:

Growth in MichiVan ridership and number of MichiVans in service.

Definition:

Comparative counts of riders and vans.

Standard:

Goal – Steady growth to match the increase in ridership and demand.

Status:

One Year (2010-2011):

- 7.5% increase in ridership
- 4.3% increase in number of vans

Five Year:


- Growth in MichiVan ridership (2007-2011) = 40%
- Growth in number of MichiVans (2007 -2011) = 36%

Last Reported Status:

- Growth in MichiVan ridership (2006-2010) = 78%
- Growth in number of MichiVans (2006 -2010) = 77%

Data is collected within MDOT:	January
Data is Updated on this website:	February/March

Expand Michivan program



[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Traffic Incident Management

AIM:

Reduce Delays: Minimize disruption to mobility resulting from incidents.

Measure:

Percentage of incidents under 2 hours.

Definition:

A traffic incident is an unplanned event that affects or impedes the normal flow of traffic. A traffic incident requires a response to protect life or property, and to mitigate its impacts. Traffic incidents, for example, include motor vehicle crashes, disabled vehicles, and other occurrences that require an emergency response.

Standard:

Target = Greater than 75% of freeway closures having a duration of less than 120 minutes.


Status:

Current percentage of incident-related freeway closures less than 120 minutes is 85.8% in July 2011.

Last Reported Status:

Percentage of incident-related freeway closures less than 120 minutes was 90.6% in September 2010.

Freeway Incidents
Target ≥ 75%



Data is collected within MDOT:	Available throughout the year
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Traffic Incident Definitions

Traffic Incident Data Collection

Freeway Courtesy Patrol

Traffic Incident Management Details (1 of 3)

Definitions:

Clearance Time:

Clearance Time is defined as, "The time between the first recordable awareness of an incident by a responsible agency and the first confirmation that all lanes are available for traffic flow."

Minor Incident:

An incident that affects or impedes the normal flow of traffic for less than 30 minutes.

Intermediate Incident:


An incident that affects or impedes the normal flow of traffic for 30 minutes or more but less than 120 minutes.

Major Incident:

An incident that affects or impedes the normal flow of traffic for more than 120 minutes.

Freeway Incidents

By Duration Category



[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

► [Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Traffic Incident Management Details (2 of 3)

Data Collection:

Data is collected from numerous sources including:

- Incident management logs from MDOT Transportation Service Centers (TSCs) and regions.
- Form 1506 (Notification Of Traffic/Roadway Incident Or Major Event) submittals.
- Statewide law enforcement UD-10 Traffic Crash Reports.
- Direct observations.
- Media reporting.
- The Michigan Intelligent Transportation System Center ([MITSC](#)).
- The West Michigan Traffic Management Center ([WMTMC](#)).

Logged Freeway Incidents


Month	Year	Total Reported Incidents	Incidents w/ Reported Duration	Incidents w/o Reported Duration	Minor Incident (<30 minutes)		Intermediate Incident (between 30 and 120 minutes)		Major Incident (>120 minutes)	
					Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
January	2010	414	392	22	149	38.0%	207	52.8%	36	9.2%
February	2010	609	586	23	182	31.1%	360	61.4%	44	7.5%
March	2010	291	281	10	108	38.4%	154	54.8%	19	6.8%
April	2010	301	287	14	112	39.0%	160	55.7%	15	5.2%
May	2010	410	395	15	165	41.8%	202	51.1%	28	7.1%
June	2010	283	271	12	101	37.3%	132	48.7%	38	14.0%
July	2010	364	345	19	106	30.7%	194	56.2%	45	13.0%
August	2010	392	383	9	121	31.6%	204	53.3%	58	15.1%
September	2010	385	373	12	131	35.1%	207	55.5%	35	9.4%
October	2010	310	302	8	126	41.7%	149	49.3%	27	8.9%
November	2010	100	92	8	21	22.8%	57	62.0%	14	15.2%
December	2010	100	91	9	17	18.7%	51	56.0%	23	25.3%
January	2011	345	334	11	115	34.4%	188	56.3%	31	9.3%
February	2011	506	492	14	198	40.2%	248	50.4%	46	9.3%
March	2011	255	246	9	88	35.8%	126	51.2%	32	13.0%
April	2011	256	247	9	113	45.7%	118	47.8%	16	6.5%
May	2011	311	284	27	111	39.1%	142	50.0%	31	10.9%
June	2011	276	269	7	90	33.5%	142	52.8%	37	13.8%
July	2011	278	274	4	93	33.9%	142	51.8%	39	14.2%


Met Goal of 75% of incidents under 120 minutes	% of Incidents Under 120 minutes
Yes	90.8%
Yes	92.5%
Yes	93.2%
Yes	94.8%
Yes	92.9%
Yes	86.0%
Yes	87.0%
Yes	84.9%
Yes	90.6%
Yes	91.1%
Yes	84.8%
No	74.7%
Yes	90.7%
Yes	90.7%
Yes	87.0%
Yes	93.5%
Yes	89.1%
Yes	86.2%
Yes	85.8%

Full Screen

On/Off

Send Feedback

 = All incidents not captured due to computer problems

 = All data not logged, but data is representative

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)


Traffic Incident Management Details (3 of 3)

A specific tool that MDOT uses to minimize disruption to mobility resulting from incidents on the highway network is the Freeway Courtesy Patrol (FCP). Established in 1994, the FCP assists stranded and distressed drivers in southeast Michigan as an integral part of the goal to reduce delays. In addition, the FCP provides assistance to motorists by reducing potential crash situations, relieving traffic congestion, and helping to create safer driving environments. For active people whose daily routines and obligations put them on the road, the patrol is an added measure of travel safety.

The FCP fleet consists of 24 vans and employs 22 drivers. FCP drivers may find an assist during routine patrol or may be dispatched to an assist by a control room operator out of the MITS Center. When the drivers are dispatched, response and clear times are recorded to ensure that assists are executed in an efficient manner.

In FY 2010, the FCP performed 52,689 stops, including 13,172 abandoned vehicles and 39,517 assists to occupied vehicles. The charts below break down the types of assists by percent and the clearance time for each type of assist. According to a 2011 report issued by the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG), in 2010, the FCP saved an estimated 11.6 million hours of delay on the freeways in the coverage area resulting in a benefit of \$15.70 for each dollar spent.

Services are funded by MDOT through a grant from the Federal Highway Administration. MDOT manages the program through the [MITS Center](#). Additional sponsors include the Michigan State Police and SEMCOG, who also provide insight to improve operations. The FCP is operated by a private company, Emergency Road Response, for MDOT.



Freeway Courtesy Patrol	
Incident Clearance Time – FY 2010	
Type	Average Clear Time
Flat Tire	20.46 minutes
No Gas	10.40 minutes
Mechanical	18.82 minutes
Accident	38.45 minutes
Debris	7.05 minutes
Other	9.23 minutes
Average	17.40 minutes

[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Carpool Parking Lot

AIM:
Maintain 90% of all

Measure:
[PASER](#) rating.

Definition:

Rating Scale		
Rating	Label	Definition
8 to 10	Good	Requires only routine maintenance
5 to 7	Fair	Requires capital preventive maintenance to reach good condition
1 to 4	Poor	Requires structural improvement to reach good condition

Standard:
90% in good or fair condition.

Status:
Currently, 96% of carpool lot pavements are in good or fair condition.

Last Reported Status:
96% of carpool lot pavements were in good or fair condition.

Click link to view: [Carpool Parking Lot Condition Details](#)

Data is collected within MDOT:	June - July
Data is Updated on this website:	August/September

Full Screen

The **Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER)** method was developed by the University of Wisconsin for determining the condition of roads according to a uniform condition rating scale. PASER is based on sound engineering principles and measures visible "surface distress" at a 1:10 scale. Because it is one of the easiest and most inexpensive means of pavement rating, PASER is very widely-used, well-supported, and ideal for agencies of all sizes.

(click to close)

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

What is a trunkline?

A trunkline is any highway or road under the jurisdiction of MDOT, and is generally marked with one of these symbols:



U.S. Route



State "M" Route



Interstate Route

(click to close)

[Overview »](#)

[Condition Trends »](#)

[Measures by Goal Area »](#)

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Tier 1 Airports Map

Tier 1 Airports A-F

Tier 1 Airports G-M


Tier 1 Airports N-Z

Tier 1 airports are those airports that respond to essential/critical state airport system goals.

Individual airport classification considers several airport development standards including:

- Primary Runway System
- Pavement Condition
- Lighting and Visual Aids
- Approach Protection
- Basic Pilot and Aircraft Services
- All-Weather Access
- Year-Round Access
- Landside Access

Airport tier designations can change based on revisions to state airport system goals and objectives, and at the discretion of the Michigan Aeronautics Commission. For more information click the link to view the Michigan Airport System Plan ([MASP](#)). See section 7 "Airport Development Standards."



[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

Tier 1 Airports Map

Tier 1 Airports A-F

Tier 1 Airports G-M

Tier 1 Airports N-Z

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

City	Airport
Adrian	Lenawee County Airport
Allegan	Padgham Field
Alma	Gratiot Community Airport
Alpena	Alpena County Regional Airport
Ann Arbor	Ann Arbor Municipal Airport
Bad Axe	Huron County Memorial Airport
Battle Creek	W. K. Kellogg Airport
Bay City	James Clements Airport
Beaver Island	Beaver Island Airport
Bellaire	Antrim County Airport
Benton Harbor	Southwest Michigan Regional Airport
Big Rapids	Roben-Hood Airport
Cadillac	Wexford County Airport
Caro	Tuscola Area Airport
Charlevoix	Charlevoix Municipal Airport
Charlotte	Fitch H. Beach Municipal Airport
Coldwater	Branch County Memorial Airport
Detroit	Coleman A. Young Municipal Airport
Detroit	Grosse Ile Municipal Airport
Detroit	Detroit Metro – Wayne County Airport
Detroit	Willow Run Airport
Drummond Island	Drummond Island Airport
Escanaba	Delta County Airport
Flint	Bishop International Airport
Frankfort	Dow Memorial Airport
Fremont	Fremont Municipal Airport

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)

[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

Tier 1 Airports Map

Tier 1 Airports A-F

Tier 1 Airports G-M

Tier 1 Airports N-Z

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

City	Airport
Gaylord	Gaylord Regional Airport
Grand Haven	Memorial Airpark
Grand Ledge	Abrams Municipal Airport
Grand Rapids	Gerald R. Ford International Airport
Grayling	Grayling Army Airfield
Hancock	Houghton County Memorial Airport
Harbor Springs	Harbor Springs Municipal Airport
Hillsdale	Hillsdale Municipal Airport
Holland	Tulip City Airport
Houghton Lake	Roscommon County – Blodgett Memorial Airport
Howell	Livingston County – Spencer J. Hardy Airport
Ionia	Ionia County Airport
Iron Mountain	Ford Airport
Iron River	Stambaugh Airport
Ironwood	Gogebic – Iron County Airport
Jackson	Jackson County – Reynolds Field
Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo/Battle Creek International Airport
Lambertville	Toledo Suburban Airport
Lansing	Capital Region International Airport
Linden	Price's Airport
Ludington	Mason County Airport
Mackinac Island	Mackinac Island Airport
Manistee	Manistee County – Blacker Airport
Manistique	Schoolcraft County Airport
Marine City	Marine City Airport
Marlette	Marlette Township Airport
Marquette	Sawyer International Airport
Mason	Mason Jewett Field
Menominee	Twin County Airport
Midland	Jack Barstow Airport
Mio	Oscoda County Airport
Monroe	Monroe Custer Airport
Mt. Pleasant	Mt. Pleasant Municipal Airport
Munising	Hanley Field
Muskegon	Muskegon County Airport

Full Screen

[Home](#)  [Back](#)  [Zoom](#) 

Overview »

Condition Trends »

Measures by Goal Area »

[Trunkline Bridges](#)

[Trunkline Pavement](#)

[Railroads](#)

[Airport Pavement](#)

[Passenger Transportation](#)

[Carpool Lot Pavement](#)

[Crash Reduction](#)

[Safety Cost Savings](#)

[Risk/Vulnerability](#)

[Facilities Modernization](#)

[Access Expansion](#)

[Traffic Incident Mgmt.](#)

Tier 1 Airports Map

Tier 1 Airports A-F

Tier 1 Airports G-M

Tier 1 Airports N-Z

City	Airport
New Hudson	Oakland Southwest Airport
Newberry	Luce County Airport
Ontonagon	Ontonagon County Shuster Field
Oscoda	Oscoda – Wurtsmith Airport
Owosso	Owosso Community Airport
Pellston	Pellston Regional Airport of Emmet County
Plymouth	Canton-Plymouth-Mettetal Airport
Point Aux Pins	Bois Blanc Island Airport
Pontiac	Oakland County International Airport
Port Huron	St. Clair County International Airport
Ray	Ray Community Airport
Rogers City	Presque Isle County/Rogers City Airport
Romeo	Romeo State Airport
Saginaw	Saginaw County H. W. Browne Airport
Saginaw	M B S International Airport
St. Ignace	Mackinac County Airport
Sault Ste. Marie	Chippewa County International Airport
Sparta	Paul C. Miller – Sparta Airport
Sturgis	Kirsch Municipal Airport
Tecumseh	Meyers-Diver's Airport
Traverse City	Cherry Capital Airport
Troy	Oakland/Troy Airport
West Branch	West Branch Community Airport

Full Screen

[On/Off](#) [Send Feedback](#)